arXiv:1202.1529v1 [hep-ph] 7 Feb 2012

Flavored bilinear R-parity violation

F. Bazzocchi[*]
International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA),
via Bonomea 265, Trieste, Italy

S. Morisi,[†] E. Peinado,[‡] and J. W. F. Valle[§]
AHEP Group, Instituto de Física Corpuscular – C.S.I.C./Universitat de València
Edificio de Institutos de Paterna, Apartado 22085, E–46071 València, Spain

A. Vicente[¶]
Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, CNRS – UMR 8627,
Université de Paris-Sud 11, F-91405 Orsay Cedex, France

Bilinear R-parity violation (BRPV) provides the simplest intrinsically supersymmetric neutrino mass generation scheme. While neutrino mixing parameters can be probed in high energy accelerators, they are unfortunately not predicted by the theory. Here we propose a model based on the discrete flavor symmetry A_4 with a single R-parity violating parameter, leading to maximal atmospheric mixing and a small but nonzero reactor angle, in agreement with experiment.

Keywords: supersymmetry; neutrino masses and mixing

I. INTRODUCTION

Significant progress in the search for the elusive Higgs boson has recently been made at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), with an intriguing 2.6σ indication that it may be lurking in the 125 GeV mass region [1]. If confirmed, this would constitute one of the most important discoveries of modern physics and would represent an incredible success for a 30-year old theory.

If the existence of the Higgs boson were confirmed, we would know that the Standard Model (SM) is indeed the correct effective description of elementary particles at least up to a scale which we still ignore. Measuring the exact Higgs boson mass would be crucial to know up to which scale the Higgs boson scalar potential is stable, or in other words at which scale we should expect new physics to emerge [2]. The hierarchy problem associated to the Higgs boson mass has suggested that new physics should appear around the TeV scale. Since the most promising extension of the SM to address the hierarchy problem is supersymmetry (SUSY), we expected that the stop or the gluino should be around the corner. However the first searches up to $\sim 5fb^{-1}$ at the LHC [3] have pushed the bounds on squark and gluino masses beyond the TeV scale. Even if the analysis have been performed within specific frameworks, such as Constrained Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (CMSSM) or minimal supergravity (MSUGRA), what the most recent results suggest is that if SUSY exists one probably should be open minded as to how exactly it is realized. Open issues in this regard are the precise mechanism of SUSY breaking and whether R-parity is conserved. Indeed, supersymmetry may well be broken by a non-gravitational messenger. Similarly, one can have supersymmetry without R-parity [4, 5]. Hence the need to consider alternative scenarios.

Apart from stabilizing the Higgs boson scalar potential supersymmetry could address other Standard Model puzzles for which new physics is invoked. One argument in support of R-parity conserving supersymmetry, is the existence of a natural cold dark matter (DM) candidate, namely the lightest neutralino. However, the gravitino can provide a perfectly valid and interesting alternative in broken R-parity models [6]. Moreover, it provides a testable minimal mechanism for the origin of neutrino masses [7]. Unfortunately in its "generic" formulation it can not address issues associated to fermion mass hierarchies and mixings, such as those of neutrinos. Could a SUSY model address in a *minimal* way all these issues? Here we propose a flavored version of bilinear R-parity violation.

Both Abelian [8] and non-Abelian [9] flavor symmetries have been used in the literature to constrain the R-parity violating terms. In this letter we propose a model with a single R-parity violating parameter allowed by the flavor symmetry $A_4 \times Z_2$, where A_4 is the group of even permutations of four objects. This R-parity violating term is used to generate neutrino masses.

The paper is organized as follows: in section II we describe neutrino mass generation through bilinear R-parity violation [4, 10], in section III we extend the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) implementing a discrete flavor symmetry. In section IV we comment on the scalar potential and finally in section V we summarize the main predictions of the model.

---

[*] fbazzo@sissa.it
[†] morisi@ific.uv.es
[‡] epeinado@ific.uv.es
[§] valle@ific.uv.es
[¶] avelino.vicente@th.u-psud.fr

II. BILINEAR R-PARITY VIOLATION

Bilinear R-parity Violation [4, 10] is the minimal extension of the MSSM that incorporates lepton number violation, providing a simple way to accommodate neutrino masses in supersymmetry. The superpotential is

$$W = W^{MSSM} + \epsilon_i \widehat{L}_i \widehat{H}_u . \tag{1}$$

The three $\epsilon_i = (\epsilon_e, \epsilon_\mu, \epsilon_\tau)$ parameters have dimensions of mass and explicitly break lepton number. Their origin (and size) can be naturally explained in extended models where the breaking of lepton number is spontaneous [11]. In that sense, BRPV can be seen as an effective description of a more general supersymmetric framework for lepton number violation. In any case, the ϵ_i are constrained to be small ($\epsilon_i \ll m_W$) in order to account for the small neutrino masses. Furthermore, the presence of the new superpotential terms implies new soft SUSY breaking terms as well

$$V_{soft}^{b\text{-}\not{R}_p} = B_{\epsilon_i} \tilde{L}_i H_u , \tag{2}$$

where the B_{ϵ_i} parameters have dimensions of mass squared. The ϵ_i and B_{ϵ_i} couplings induce vacuum expectation values (VEVs) for the sneutrinos, $\langle \tilde{\nu}_L \rangle \equiv v_{L_i}$. These are proportional to the ϵ_i parameters, hence small, as required.

In the presence of BRPV couplings neutrinos and neutralinos mix, giving rise to neutrino masses [12–14]. In the basis $(\psi^0)^T = (-i\tilde{B}^0, -i\tilde{W}_3^0, \widetilde{H}_d^0, \widetilde{H}_u^0, \nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau)$ the neutral fermion mass matrix M_N is given by

$$M_N = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{\chi^0} & m^T \\ m & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\chi^0}$ is the usual neutralino mass matrix and

$$m = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} g' v_{L_e} & \frac{1}{2} g v_{L_e} & 0 & \epsilon_e \\ -\frac{1}{2} g' v_{L_\mu} & \frac{1}{2} g v_{L_\mu} & 0 & \epsilon_\mu \\ -\frac{1}{2} g' v_{L_\tau} & \frac{1}{2} g v_{L_\tau} & 0 & \epsilon_\tau \end{pmatrix} , \tag{4}$$

is the matrix that characterizes the breaking of R-parity. Note that its elements are suppressed with respect to those in $\mathcal{M}_{\chi^0}$ due to the smallness of the ϵ_i parameters. Therefore, the resulting M_N matrix has a type-I seesaw structure and the effective light neutrino mass matrix can be obtained with the usual formula $m_\nu^0 = -m \cdot \mathcal{M}_{\chi^0}^{-1} m^T$, which can be expanded to give

$$\left(m_\nu^0\right)_{ij} = a^{(0)} \Lambda_i \Lambda_j , \tag{5}$$

where $a^{(0)}$ is a combination of SUSY parameters and

$$\Lambda_i = \mu v_i + v_d \epsilon_i , \tag{6}$$

are the so-called *alignment parameters*. The projective form of m_ν^0 implies only one eigenvalue is non-zero. The corresponding eigenvector is characterized by

$$\tan\theta_{13} = -\frac{\Lambda_e}{(\Lambda_\mu^2 + \Lambda_\tau^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} , \tag{7}$$

$$\tan\theta_{23} = -\frac{\Lambda_\mu}{\Lambda_\tau} . \tag{8}$$

In order to account for oscillation data we need two mass scales, Δm_{atm}^2 and Δm_{sol}^2, and the solar mixing angle. Indeed, the required solar mass scale, $\Delta m_{sol}^2 \ll \Delta m_{atm}^2$, arises radiatively, at the 1-loop level, correcting the tree-level neutrino mass matrix in Eq. (5). Detailed computations of the 1-loop contributions to the neutrino mass matrix can be found in Refs. [12, 13]. The corrections are of the type

$$\left(m_\nu^1\right)_{ij} \approx a^{(1)} \Lambda_i \Lambda_j + b^{(1)} (\Lambda_i \epsilon_j + \Lambda_j \epsilon_i) + c^{(1)} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j , \tag{9}$$

where the coefficients $a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}, c^{(1)}$ are complicated functions of the SUSY parameters. This generates a second non-zero mass eigenstate associated with the solar scale, and the corresponding mixing angle θ_{12}. Note that the neutrino mixing angles are determined as ratios of $\not{R}_p$ parameters ϵ_i and Λ_i, see, e. g. Eqs. (7) and (8).

Let us say a few words about the phenomenology of BRPV. The breaking of R-parity has an immediate consequence at colliders: the LSP in no longer stable and decays typically inside the detectors. Since LSP decays and neutrino masses have a common origin, one can show that ratios of LSP decay branching ratios correlate with the neutrino mixing angles measured at low energies [15]. This establishes a tight link which allows one to use neutrino oscillation data to test the model at the LHC see e. g. [16].

III. THE MODEL

Let us consider the MSSM particle content extended with one extra singlet superfield $\hat{S}$ and a $A_4 \times Z_2$ flavor symmetry with the assignments given in table I. The superfield $\hat{S}$ is required in order to generate the μ term, and is the only singlet under A_4. On the other hand the Z_2 symmetry forbids all $\not{R}_p$ operators with the only exception of the bilinear terms LH_u, while the quark and charged lepton sectors are very similar to those in [17]. The assumption that all matter fields as well as the up and down Higgs doublets are in triplet representations of A_4 reduces the different BRPV parameters to only one.

	$\hat{Q}$	$\hat{u}^c$	$\hat{d}^c$	$\hat{L}$	$\hat{e}^c$	$\hat{H}_u$	$\hat{H}_d$	$\hat{S}$
A_4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1
Z_2	$+$	$-$	$+$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$+$	$-$

TABLE I. The model assignments

The superpotential of the model is

$$\mathcal{W} = Y(\widehat{L}\,\widehat{e}^c)_3\,\widehat{H}_d + \epsilon\,\widehat{L}\,\widehat{H}_u + \lambda\,\widehat{H}_u\,\widehat{H}_d\,\hat{S} + m_S\,\hat{S}\,\hat{S}. \tag{10}$$

Note that, due to the product rule $3 \times 3 = 1 + 1' + 1'' + 3_1 + 3_2$, where $1, 1', 1''$ are different singlets of A_4 and $3_{1,2}$ are different triplets, the assignment in table I allows for two different contractions in the usual charged lepton Yukawa interactions, compactly denoted by the first term in eq. (10). This leads to the couplings $Y_\delta|\epsilon^\delta_{ijk}|\,L_i e^c_j H_{d_k}$ with $\delta = 1, 2$. For $\delta = 1$ $(ijk) = (123), (231), (312)$ and for $\delta = 2$ $(ijk) = (213), (321), (132)$. The resulting quarks and charged lepton mass matrices have the form [17, 18]

$$M_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y_1^f\langle H_3^f\rangle & y_2^f\langle H_2^f\rangle \\ y_2^f\langle H_3^f\rangle & 0 & y_1^f\langle H_1^f\rangle \\ y_1^f\langle H_2^f\rangle & y_2^f\langle H_1^f\rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad f = u,\ d,\ l, \tag{11}$$

where d-type quarks and charged fermions l couple to the same Higgs. Note that since all matter fields and Higgs scalars are in triplets of A_4, the diagonal elements of the charged fermion mass matrices vanish. With the VEV alignment

$$\langle H_u\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_{u_1}, v_{u_2}, v_{u_3}) \propto (r^u, \alpha^u, \alpha^u) \tag{12}$$

$$\langle H_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_{d_1}, v_{d_2}, v_{d_3}) \propto (r^d, \alpha^d, \alpha^d) \tag{13}$$

$$\langle \tilde{\nu}_L\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_{L_e}, v_{L_\mu}, v_{L_\tau}) \propto (a^\nu, b^\nu, b^\nu) \tag{14}$$

we have in the charged fermion sector nine parameters, one of which can be reabsorbed. These are used to fit nine masses and three mixing angles, hence four predictions emerge [17], given below as eqs. (15) and (16), in addition to $V_{ub} = 0 = V_{cb}$ (at this stage we have unmixed leptons and CP conserved in the quark sector, non-zero V_{ub}, V_{cb} arising, say, by coupling vector-like quarks).

The first prediction is a quark-lepton mass relation

$$\frac{m_\tau}{\sqrt{m_e m_\mu}} \approx \frac{m_b}{\sqrt{m_d m_s}}, \tag{15}$$

which follows from the equality of the two functions $r^d(m_d, m_s, m_b) = r^l(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau)$.

The second is a prediction for the Cabibbo angle, which follows from the fact that the matrix in eq. (11) is diagonalized by

$$U_f \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{\frac{m_1^f}{m_2^f}} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{\frac{m_1^f}{m_2^f}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

Let us now turn to the neutrino sector. As already discussed in the previous section, the tree level neutrino mass matrix in eq. (5) has rank one. But it is straightforward to show that with the VEV alignment in eqs. (12), (13) and (14) we have

$$\Lambda_\mu = \Lambda_\tau\,, \tag{17}$$

where the Λ_i defined in (6) now take the form

$$\Lambda_i = \mu v_{L_i} + v_{d_i}\epsilon, \tag{18}$$

Note that the $\epsilon_i v_d$ contributions of generic BRPV models have now become ϵv_{d_i} due to the flavor symmetry. The resulting tree-level neutrino mass matrix m_ν^0 is $\mu - \tau$ invariant giving maximal atmospheric mixing angle $\tan\theta_{23} = 1$.

Once the 1-loop corrections are included $m_\nu = m_\nu^0 + m_\nu^1$ no longer has two degenerate zero eigenvalues and one can fit the two square mass differences as well as the solar angle. Note that the 1-loop corrections in eq. (9) still preserve the $\mu-\tau$ invariance because of the alignment conditions $v_{d_2} = v_{d_3}$. As a result of the $\mu - \tau$ symmetry in the neutrino mass matrix we find that the neutrino mixing angles are $\theta_{13}^\nu = 0$ and $\sin\theta_{23} = 1/\sqrt{2}$. However, the charged leptons are diagonalized by a $1 - 2$ rotation of the form eq. (16). This matrix gives small corrections to the neutrino mixing angles, in particular we predict the reactor mixing angle to be

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{m_e}{m_\mu} \approx 0.0025, \tag{19}$$

which is within the 3σ allowed determined in [19].

The solar mass square difference as well as the solar mixing angle can be fitted as shown explicitly in Ref. [12]. Note that these follow from the fact that 1-loop contributions are disaligned with respect to the tree level one.

IV. SCALAR POTENTIAL AND SPECTRUM

Additional Higgs doublets are a common feature of models with flavor symmetries. In our case the $A_4 \times Z_2$ flavor symmetry leads to accidental continuous symmetries in the scalar potential which, after they get spontaneously broken by the corresponding VEVs, imply the existence of physical Goldstone bosons coupled to the gauge bosons. We have checked in detail that the presence of terms that break softly both SUSY and A_4 but preserve Z_2 leads to phenomenologically viable scenarios for the potential in this model.

The minimization of the scalar potential must also lead to the required vacuum alignment. This restricts the allowed parameter space. For example, the conditions $\alpha^u \ll r^u$ and $\alpha^d \ll r^d$ can be fulfilled with large soft masses for the second and third generations of Higgs doublets. This has important consequences on the mass spectrum, which contains several degenerate $\{H^0, A^0, H^\pm\}$ sets, some of which with masses in the $10 - 100$ TeV range. This degeneracy is very strong in the case of H^0

and A^0 and only slightly broken for $H^\pm$ due to its mixing with the charged sleptons.

Another interesting feature of the spectrum is the decrease of the mass of the scalar singlet for increasing $\tan\beta = \frac{v_{u_1}}{v_{d_1}}$. Neglecting the mixing with the doublet states, the leading contribution to the scalar singlet squared mass is

$$m^2_{SS} = \frac{\tan\beta\, v^2(2\lambda m_S + T_\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}(1+\tan^2\beta)v_s}, \tag{20}$$

where T_λ is the soft trilinear coupling associated to λ, $\langle S\rangle = v_s/\sqrt{2}$ and $v = 246$ GeV is the usual electroweak VEV. Eq. (20) shows that m^2_{SS} scales as $1/\tan\beta$ for sufficiently large $\tan\beta$, leading to $m^2_{SS} \ll v^2$ for $\tan\beta \gtrsim 10$. For example, for $\tan\beta \sim 10$ one can easily have a light scalar singlet in the range of $5-20$ GeV, leading to a potentially sizeable invisible Higgs decay channel. This result follows from the flavor symmetry. In fact, the Z_2 symmetry forbids the usual κS^3 term in the superpotential which would otherwise contribute to the mass of the scalar singlet.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have extended the (next to) MSSM by implementing a discrete non Abelian flavor symmetry $A_4\times Z_2$. The most general renormalizable allowed superpotential forbids all the trilinear RPV terms (including those violating baryon number) and has a single bilinear R-parity violating term. Three copies of up and down Higgs doublets are required, in addition to a SU(3) × SU(2) × U(1) singlet present in $\hat{S}$, odd under Z_2. When these develop VEVs both the electroweak and flavor symmetries are broken and, in addition, sneutrinos acquire tiny VEVs. The Higgs fields align so as to recover the correct charged fermion mass hierarchies and the two successful predictions Eqs. (15) and (16) [17].

The neutrino mass matrix arises as in the usual BRPV models, with the 1-loop radiative corrections providing the solar angle and mass splitting. Similarly, the usual correlations between LSP decays and neutrino mixing angles emerge [16]. However, due to the flavor symmetry and vacuum alignment, both the tree level and the 1-loop contributions are $\mu-\tau$ invariant, leading to nearly maximal atmospheric mixing and a prediction for the reactor angle, $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \approx 0.01$.

Finally, even though the usual neutralino LSP is lost as dark matter candidate, one can show that a relatively light gravitino provides a valid alternative [6].

We thank Martin Hirsch for useful discussions. Work supported by the Spanish MEC under grants FPA2008-00319/FPA, FPA2011-22975 and MULTIDARK CSD2009-00064 (Consolider-Ingenio 2010 Programme), by Prometeo/2009/091 (Generalitat Valenciana), by the EU ITN UNILHC PITN-GA-2009-237920. S. M. is supported by a Juan de la Cierva contract, E. P. by CONACyT (Mexico) and A.V. by the ANR project CPV-LFV-LHC NT09-508531.

---

[1] Talks by F. Gianotti and G. Tonelli for the ATLAS and CMS collaborations, CERN, 13/12/2011.

[2] See, e. g. J. Elias-Miro *et al.*, 1112.3022.

[3] See e.g. talk by Eva Halkiadakis for the CMS collaboration, 31/1/2012.

[4] L. J. Hall and M. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. **B231**, 419 (1984).

[5] G. G. Ross and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B151**, 375 (1985); J. R. Ellis *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B150**, 142 (1985).

[6] D. Restrepo, M. Taoso, J. W. F. Valle and O. Zapata, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 023523 (2012), [1109.0512].

[7] M. Hirsch and J. W. F. Valle, New J. Phys. **6**, 76 (2004).

[8] V. Ben-Hamo and Y. Nir, Phys.Lett. **B339**, 77 (1994). T. Banks, Y. Grossman, E. Nardi and Y. Nir, Phys.Rev. **D52**, 5319 (1995), [hep-ph/9505248]. P. Binetruy, E. Dudas, S. Lavignac and C. A. Savoy, Phys.Lett. **B422**, 171 (1998), [hep-ph/9711517]. J. R. Ellis, S. Lola and G. G. Ross, Nucl.Phys. **B526**, 115 (1998), [hep-ph/9803308]. J. M. Mira, E. Nardi, D. A. Restrepo and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B492**, 81 (2000), [hep-ph/0007266]. G. Bhattacharyya, H. Pas and D. Pidt, Phys.Rev. **D84**, 113009 (2011), [1109.6183].

[9] C. D. Carone, L. J. Hall and H. Murayama, Phys.Rev. **D54**, 2328 (1996), [hep-ph/9602364]. G. Bhattacharyya, Phys.Rev. **D57**, 3944 (1998). Y. Kajiyama, E. Itou and J. Kubo, Nucl.Phys. **B743**, 74 (2006), [hep-ph/0511268]. Y. Kajiyama, JHEP **0704**, 007 (2007); Y. Daikoku and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. **D82** (2010) 033007.

[10] M. A. Diaz, J. C. Romao and J. W. F. Valle, Nucl. Phys. **B524**, 23 (1998).

[11] A. Masiero and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 273 (1990); J. C. Romao, C. A. Santos and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B288**, 311 (1992); J. C. Romao, A. Ioannisian and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 427.

[12] M. Hirsch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 113008 (2000), [hep-ph/0004115], Err-ibid. **D65**:119901,2002.

[13] M. A. Diaz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 013009 (2003).

[14] E. J. Chun and S. K. Kang, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 075012 (2000), [hep-ph/9909429].

[15] B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Roy and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. **B443**, 191 (1998). S. Y. Choi, E. J. Chun, S. K. Kang and J. S. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 075002 (1999). J. C. Romao *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 071703 (2000). W. Porod *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 115004 (2001).

[16] F. De Campos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 075002 (2010).

[17] S. Morisi, E. Peinado, Y. Shimizu and J. W. F. Valle, Phys.Rev. **D84**, 036003 (2011), [1104.1633].

[18] S. Morisi and E. Peinado, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 113011 (2009), [0910.4389].

[19] T. Schwetz, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, New J.Phys. **13**, 109401 (2011); New J. Phys. **13**, 063004 (2011).